

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Diana Jordan,

C/A No. 3:18-2083-JFA-SVH

Plaintiff,

v.

Patricia Foldessey; J.P. Morgan Chase Bank; Brandy Snyder; Ashley Shaffer; Barbara Periera; Nathan Ballentine; and South Carolina House of Representatives,

Defendants.

**ORDER**

Diana Jordan (“Plaintiff”), proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed this Complaint against Patricia Foldessey, J.P. Morgan Chase Bank, Brandy Snyder, Ashley Shaffer, Barbara Periera, Nathan Ballentine, and the South Carolina House of Representatives (“Defendants”) concerning the sale of 124 Bakersland Road, Chapin, South Carolina. (ECF No. 1). Plaintiff filed her Complaint on July 27, 2018. *Id.* Thereafter, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), (D.S.C.), the case was referred to a Magistrate Judge for review. The Magistrate Judge assigned to this action<sup>1</sup> prepared a thorough Report and Recommendation (“Report”) and


---

<sup>1</sup> The Magistrate Judge’s review is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

opines that this Court should dismiss the Complaint without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. (ECF No. 9). The Report sets forth in detail the relevant facts and standards of law on this matter, and the Court incorporates such without a recitation. Plaintiff was advised of her right to file objections to the Report, which was entered on the docket on August 9, 2018. *Id.* The Magistrate Judge required Plaintiff to file objections to the Report by August 23, 2018. *Id.* However, Plaintiff did not file objections and the time to do so has now expired. In the absence of specific objections to the Report of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge's recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). The Magistrate Judge has allowed the Plaintiff ample time to respond to the Court's orders and the Plaintiff has failed to do so.

After carefully reviewing the applicable laws, the record in this case, as well as the Report, this Court finds the Magistrate Judge's recommendation fairly and accurately summarizes the facts and applies the correct principles of law. Accordingly, the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation. Plaintiff's Complaint is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



September 4, 2018  
Columbia, South Carolina

Joseph F. Anderson, Jr.  
United States District Judge